tant problems plus the language issue, which is an all-India question anyway, because there are Nepalese-speaking people in other parts of the country also. It is not specific to Sikkim. But it has a certain significance in the Sikkimese context. These are the two or three important questions which we have to sort out, if we do not allow them or do not want to allow them to become election issues. This is the background against which extension is being sought. It is a matter concerned with the whole Sikkimese people and we have to sort it out in the interests of the nation as a whole. We just cannot allow any of these problems, any of these issues, to be a divisive issue at the time of election. That is why this extension is being sought. This is for a specific purpose. I am sorry that Shri A. P. Sharma has been brought in, Mr. Ram Lal has been brought in, Andhra Pradesh has been brought in... (*Interruptions*) West Bengal has been brought in. Finally, Sikkim has become a peg to hang the West Bengal hat, Andhra hat and so many other hats are being hung on this peg, Sir. That is not at all relevant. (*Interruptions*)

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : आप का कान्क्रीट सोल्यूशन क्या है ?

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंह राव : इसी के लिए मैं कह रहा हूं अभी समय लगेगा। अभी जो राज्यपाल हैं वह अपनी तरफ से कोशिश कर रहे हैं । कोशिश तो हमारी होगी कि उस से कोई ऐसा नतीजा निकले, कोई ऐसा हल निकले जिससे यह इलेक्शन में एक इशू बन कर खडा न हो जाये। यह हमारी कोशिश है, इसीलिए कुछ समय चाहिए, महीने-दो महीने में नहीं होगा, सभी लोगों से बात करनी पड़ेगी और इसी कारण हम यह एक्सटेंशन चाहते हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 25th May 1984, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Sikkim, for a further period of six months, with effect from the 25th November, 1984"

The motion was adopted.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: CONTINUANCE IN FORCE OF THE PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE 6TH OCTOBER 1983, UNDER ARTICLES 356 OF THE CONSTITUTION, IN RELATION TO .. THE STATE OF PUNJAB ..

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 6th October, 1983, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Punjab, for a further period of six months with effect from the 6th October, 1984."

The question was proposed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think this matter has been discussed many times. Some Members may speak. But there is no need for a long debate.

SHRI K. MOHANAN (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, just now we have finished discussion on a resolution seeking approval for extending the President's rule in Sikkim for another six months. The participants in that discussion talked about the impropriety on the part of the Government to impose President's rule in the State of Sikkim. But the im-

[Shri K. Mohanan]

position of President's rule in Punjab nearly 10 months back was in quite a differnt context. It was on the assumption that the democratically elected Government in that State was the main impediment to curb the activities of the terrorists in Punjab. What happened all these days of the Centre's direct rule in Punjab? I am not going into the details of these things because we have already discussed the Punjab issue so many times on the floor of the House. Even now, there is no sign on the horizon to settle the Punjab issue in a manner satisfactory to all concerned. By this time, the Government have already armed itself with more powers by enacting the legislations like N.S.A. (Amendment) Bill and the Terrorist Affected Areas (Special Courts) Bill, etc. It was clear from all these moves that the Government is still depending on extra-ordinary administrative measures to settle the problem of Punjab which has proved to be an exercise in futility. At the same time, there is no effort on the part of the Government to find out an acceptable solution to the Punjab problem with the help of all concerned.

Here the Resolution is to extend the President's rule for another six months. It means the military rule in Punjab for another six months. I oppose this Resolution on this consideration. My demand is for the restoration of civil administration in that State as early as possible. It has been undoubtedly established in the recent incidents that even the Army rule in Punjab could not contain or uproot the terrorists' activities in that State. A political consciousness and a political awareness among the people is a must to fight against terrorism in Punjab. It is the need of the hour. We cannot continue mililtary rule or President's rule in Punjab or in any other part of this country indefinitely. A political solution is a must. I do agree that it is a difficult job. But my complaint is that the Government is least concerned on that point. You are still depending or relying upon the administrative measures, extra-ordinary administrative measures and the Armed Forces. I am saying this with the background of the recent incident of hijacking of the plane last Friday. Whatever may be the explanation, it is a fact that the hijackers were able to board the plane from Chandigarh which is a most vulnerable point and which is virtually under the military rule. You blamed Farooq Abdullah for such an incident when it took place last month in Kashmir. Now, I would like to know who is to be blamed for this thing. There is the direct rule of Centre in Chandigarh. Now, Sir, I am not going into that part of the incident because we have already discussed that. So, instead of giving a healing touch to the Punjab problem, the Government is again trying to complicate the whole issue of creating another fundamentalist. in the form of Bhindranwale. It is my complaint. I appeal to the Government and to the ruling party to desist from such a dangerous political game. Even the imperialists failed in their policy of divide and rule. I would like to tell the Government that they cannot continue the policy of divide and rule in this country for a long time. I appeal to my friends on the opposite side to be self-critical for a moment. Even after 37 years of independence where are we? Have we been able to build a strong nation above all considerations of caste, creed, religion or region? No, Sir. On the basic principle of unity in diversity to build a strong nation even after 37 years in that direction, it has been a failure on our part. You are blaming the opposition for each and every thing. But I would like to remind you that when you were in

power for all these 37 years, it is the wrong policies of the Government of India that are responsible for this state of affairs in our country. Sir, the recent developments in this country including Punjab, Assam, J & K and now in Andhra are glaring examples of the policy pursued by this Government. (*Time bell rings*). Sir, I am concluding. In the end, Sir, I say that I oppose this Resolution mainly because of the inaction on the part of the Government to solve the Punjab issue in a democratic manner by taking the people into confidence. On the other hand, the Government is trying to extend the President's rule, which is virtually the military rule. That is why I am opposing this Resolution.

DR. SHANTI G. PATEL (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have already participated in this debate when the Constitution Amendment Bill was brought and powers were taken to extend the President's rule for more than a year. That is why I would like to be very brief. Sir, the aspects of the situation with which we are faced with in Punjab, particularly to those of us who have been involved in the freedom movement, are, very traumatic. Sir, a situation exists wherein there is a feeling of alienation and estrangement amongst the Members of the Sikh community. This is something which is very serious and has to be tackled in a manner so that we are able to keep the integrity and unity of the country as it is. Sir, I referred to the freedom movement because at that time we thought that our country will not remain merely united but will move from prosperity to prosperity. What we find is that the situation in Punjab is such which has affected this particular march and we have been affected to the extent that the granary of the country has also been affected. The place where the green revolution took place is a place today where one is not talking of advance on the agricultural front, but as to how we can solve the present problem. This is the situation in which we are placed today. It is not my desire to apportion blame; but at the same time I would like to say—and with all the emphasis—that we should pose a question to ourselves as to why this situation has been developing. One can blame the terrorists; one can blame all those persons who have indulged in human acts. I am one with them and I have no hesitation in doing so. But is that enough? Is the military action or a stick rule enough? There is something more than that which is called for in the present situation if it is to be checked from further deterioration and if normalcy is to be restored.

Sir, at present, as it has been said, that there has been an Assembly which is of course, in suspended animation; but there are elected members but the popular government is not sought to be trusted. There is something else which is being brought in which will look after the interests of this particular State. Why is it necessary? If a solution has to be found in the present situation, extention of President's rule is not the answer. It requires a political solution and the matter has to be approached from that angle. What is necessary in the present situation is to develop a consensus amongst all the parties concerned, and that is how you can break the present stalemate; and any other way, whether military action or anything else, is not going to bring us nearer to the solution. It will inevitably lead to further estrangement and further alienation. What has happened, whether we like it or not, is not a matter of one's choice.

[Dr. Shanti G. Patel]

Entry of army has affected the hearts of almost all the Sikhs. It is a matter of feelings, sentiments, religious belief; it is an issue on which no argument or reason will work. We must be realistic; we must realise. It is a delicate situation and we must try to handle it in a particular manner.

Sir, the example of our friend from this House, Mr. Khushwant Singh, is of significance. He is the one man who condemned Bhindranwale; he opposed the Anandpur Sahib Resolution, and all the terrorist activities. But as soon as army entry took place, he had to re-think and had to say that this is something which is beyond limit; it is something which should not have happened, because it is something which is against the national interest, against the integrity and unity of the country.

I would, therefore, request the Government to re-think over the matter and find a political solution to this problem so that the country is saved from further troubles and further difficulties.

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायणयादव : (बिहार) उपसभापति महोदय, इस सदन में पंजाब के सवाल पर बहुत बहस हो चुकी है।

श्री उपसभापति : परसों ही इस पर बहस हुई थी।

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : बहस काफी हो चुकी है। लेकिन बुनियादी एक सवाल यह है कि जैसा कि विरोधी दल कहते हैं कि संविधान ने जो केन्द्र को यह ताकत दी है तो संविधान निर्माताओं ने यह हक जो केन्द्र को दिया था तो यह मानकर दिया था कि यदि ऐसा परिस्थिति कभी पैदा होगी तो केन्द्र के जरिये इसका इस्तेमाल किया जायेगा। लेकिन आज केन्द्र के जरिये जो इस संविधान के, इस अनुच्छेद का प्रयोग किया जाता है वह अच्छी मंशा से नहीं किया जाता है। इसके कारण देश के लोगों के अन्दर शंका पैदा हुई है। अभी जो संविधान के तहत इस धारा का इस्तेमाल हुआ है उसका मतलब क्या है? राज्य के अन्दर अगर वास्तव में, च में, अगर कोई ऐसा विवाद खड़ा हो जाए, राजनैतिक विवाद खड़ा हो जाए या राजनैतिक अस्थिरता आ जाए तो उसी हालत में ही 1 P. M. केन्द्र राज्य में हस्तक्षेप करे। लेकिन बात ऐसी नहीं है। केन्द्र के खिलाफ लड़ाई नहीं है। हम इसलिए नहीं लड़ते अभी मान लीजिये कांग्रेस की सरकार है तब मैं इसका विरोध कर रहा हूं ऐसी बात नहीं है। जनता पार्टी की सरकार के समय में भी हम लोग इसके विरोधी थे और हम लोग इसलिए विरोधी थे डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया यह कहा करते थे समाजवादी आन्दोलन से जुड़े हुए लोगों की मान्यता रही है कि यह देश इतना बड़ा विशाल देश है, इस में हर प्रांत में हर तरह के फूल खिलेंगे, भारत माता की फुलवाड़ी तभी सुन्दर दिखाई देगी। इसमें विभिन्न तरह के फूल खिलेंगे, विभिन्न तरह के फूल हैं विभिन्न प्रांतों में विभिन्न धर्म हैं, विभिन्न सम्प्रदाय को मानने वाले लोग हैं लेकिन केन्द्र का मतलब केन्द्रीय शासन नहीं केन्द्र का मतलब होता है कि केन्द्र में बैठा हुआ कोई एक नेता चाहे कांग्रेस (आई) का हो चाहे किसी और दल का आ जाए जो केन्द्र में बैठा हुआ नेता होता है। सत्ता वाली पार्टी होती है उस सत्ता वाली पार्टी के विरोध में या केन्द्र में जो सत्ता की पार्टी के नेता हैं उसके विरोध में

कोई भी ताकत हिन्दुस्तान में पनपने नहीं दें उस ताकत को कुचल दिया जाएगा, मसल दिया जाएगा, रौंद दिया जाएगा, उसको सिर उठाने नहीं दिया जाएगा और यही प्रवृत्ति थी जिस प्रवृत्ति ने हिन्दुस्तान का बंटवारा किया था । मैं कायदे आज़म मोहम्मद जिन्ना को हिन्दुस्तान के बंटवारे के लिए अपराधी नहीं मानता, कायदे आज़म जितने अपराधी थे उससे बड़ा अपराधी हिन्दुतान का नेतृत्व था जिस ने कायदे आज़म जिन्ना को मजबूर किया था बंटवारे के लिए कहा गया जिन्ना तुम कुछ नहीं हो, तुम डाऊन ट्रोडन फ्लावर हो, तुम मसल दिये जाओगे, तुम्हारी कोई हैसियत नहीं है । हिन्दुस्तान में यहां विभिन्न सम्प्रदायों, विभिन्न धर्मों और विभिन्न विचारों के लोगों को अगर हम कहेंगे तुम्हारी कोई हैसियत नहीं है तुम को कुचल देंगे, मसल देंगे, डडा डंडा कर ठीक कर देंगे, लाठी से ठीक कर देंगे, गोली-बारूद से ठीक कर देंगे, इससे उनका दिल टूटेगा. कहीं न कहीं केन्द्र के खिलाफ वे विद्रोही बनेंगे ।

(व्यवधान)

श्री महेन्द्र मोहन मिश्र (बिहार) : कोई गलत बात रिकार्ड पर नहीं जानी चाहिये । जिन्ना ने कब कहा था कि तुम कुचल दिये जाओगे (व्यवधान)

श्री हुकमदेव नारायण यादव : भारत विभाजन के अपराधी, गिल्टी मैन आफ इण्डियाज़ पार्टीशन, आपकी इस लाइब्रेरी में किताब है उसको निकाल कर पढ़िये । श्री कल्पनाथ राय जी इस किताब को पढ़े हुए हैं । नहीं तो उनके घर जा कर पढ़ लीजिए । (व्यवधान)

श्री विश्वजित पृथ्वीजित सिंह (महाराष्ट्र) : महोदय, आप बुरा मत मानिये मैं आपसे एक छोटी सी बात कहना चाहता हूं । मोहम्मद अली जिन्ना के बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है । मोहम्मद अली जिन्ना मेरे दादा के करीबी दोस्त थे । हमारे खानदान के पुराने दोस्त थे । हम उनके खानदान को जानते थे और वे हमारे खानदान को जानते थे । यह बात कहना कि मोहम्मद अली जिन्ना को हिन्दुस्तान के नेताओं ने यह कहा कि आपकी जाति खराब है, आपका मज़हब खराब है किसी ने ऐसा नहीं कहा । महात्मा जी ने शुरू से हमेशा यही कहा है कि यह देश जो है पूरी तरह से सेकुलर है यहां हर मज़हब के लिए कोई न कोई जगह है, यही कारण है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में मुसलमानों की पापुलेशन पाकिस्तान से ज्यादा है । मैं माननीय सदस्यों को यह बताना चाहता हूं । (व्यवधान)

श्री सयद अहमद हाशमी : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : मैं इतनी बात कहना चाहता हूं कि वह तंग नज़री की बात करना चाहते हैं और यही तंग नज़री है जिसने हिन्दुस्तान को तक्सीम कराया यही असल वजह है जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ । आज भी तंग नज़री का व्यवहार किया जा रहा है उसके नतीजे के अन्दर इस किस्म की चीजें पैदा होती हैं । यह त्वारीखी फेक्ट है . . . (व्यवधान) . . . तंग नज़री थी जिसके नतीजे में यह देश तक्सोम केके दहाने पर पहुंचा है । माफ़ कीजिए हम तो उन लोगों में से हैं जिन्होंने जिन्दगी भर जिन्ना की मुख़ालफ़त की, हमेशा उनके खिलाफ लड़े । यह फेक्ट है (व्यवधान)

†[شری سید احمد هاشمی

(اتر پردیش) : میں اتلی بات

†[ ]Transliteration in Arabic Script.

کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ تنگ نظری کی بات کرنا چاہتے ہیں - اور یہی تنگ نظری ہے جسنے ہندوستان کو تقسیم کرایا یہی اصل وجہ ہے جسکا نتیجہ یہ ہوا - آج یہی تنگ نظری کا ویوہار کیا جا رہا ہے اسکے نتیجہ کے اندر اس قسم کی چیزیں پیدا ہوتی ہیں - یہ تاریخی پیکٹ ہے .... (مداخلت) .... تنگ نظری تھی جسکے نتیجہ میں یہ دیش تقسیم کے دھانے پر پہنچا ہے - معاف کیجئے ہم تو ان لوگوں میں سے ہیں جنہوں نے زندگی بھر جناح کی مخالفت کی ہمیشہ انکے خلاف لڑے - یہ فیکٹ ہے .... (مداخلت) ....]

श्रीमती ममूना सुल्तान (मध्य प्रदेश) : मैं जो दरख्वास्त कर रही हूं वह यह है कि बात ऐसी निकल आई जिस पर मुझे कुछ कहना पड़ रहा है वरन् कहना नहीं चाहती थी । जो बात अभी जिन्ना साहब के बारे में कही गई मैं इसकी पूरी ताईद करती हूं । जिन्ना साहब के बारे में जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान की त्वारीख पढ़ी है हिन्दुस्तान के बंटवारे में उनका हाथ रहा है लेकिन उनके बारे में महात्मा गांधी ने या कभी भी किसी हिन्दुस्तानी लीडर ने या हिन्दुस्तान के आवाम ने उनके मज़हब के बारे में ऐसा नहीं कहा । उनकी जो एप्रोच थी उससे जरूर शिकायत हुई, यह होनी चाहिये थी। लेकिन उनकी जात के बारे ऊपर कभी किसी किस्म की कोई नुक्ताचीनी.. **(व्यवधान)** नहीं की गयी.. **(व्यवधान)**

श्री विश्वजित पृथ्वीजित सिंह : आर०एस०एस० के लीडर थे उन्होंने जरूर कुछ कहा था, यह मैं मानने को तैयार हूं . . . **(व्यवधान)**

श्री उपसभापति : चलिए, इनको बोलने दीजिए, हो गयी बात, खत्म करिये ।

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : उपसभापति महोदय, मैंने उन बातों को इसलिए उठाया था. . **(व्यवधान)** आपने कहा खत्म करो लेकिन मुझे रोक दिया गया इन लोगों ने मेरी बात को लम्बा करने को मजबूर किया है । मैं इतिहास के उस पृष्ठ को रख रहा था । कांग्रेस पार्टी के इतिहास के उस पन्ने को निकालिए, अंतिम कार्य समिति की बैठक हो रही थी, महात्मा गांधी, राष्ट्रपिता बापू ने प्रस्ताव दिया था कि हिन्दुस्तान के बंटवारे को रोकने के लिए कायदे आजम मुहम्मद जिन्ना को भी हिन्दुस्तान का प्रधान मंत्री मान सकते हैं यदि वे कहें कि हम कोई भी ऐसा काम नहीं करेंगे जो हिन्दुओं के खिलाफ होगा । अगर कायदे आजम, जिन्ना राष्ट्र विरोधी आदमी थे*

श्री उपसभापति : Please don't record this part of the statement. This will not go on record. महात्मा गांधी के बारे में जो कहा है वह नहीं लिखा जायेगा ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह मजाक की बात भी नही हो सकती है ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप स्थान ग्रहण कीजिए । बैठ जाइये ।

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : जबर्दस्ती बैठ जाने को कहेंगे तो हम कसे बैठेंगे...(**व्यवधान**) हम अपनी बात कह रहे हैं और हमको डिस्टर्ब कर रहे हैं..(**व्यवधान**) आप उनको क्यों नहीं रोकते हैं ।

DR. JOSEPH LEON D'SOUZA (Maharashtra): With due respect to the Father of the Nation, this must be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has already been expunged.

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : मैंने महात्मा गांधी जी के विरोध में नहीं कहा । मैंने कहा कि स्वयं महात्मा गांधी जी ने...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री उपसभापति : देखिए जो विषय है उस पर आइये ।

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : विषय पर...(**व्यवधान**) तो कह रहा हूं ।

श्री उपसभापति : बिल्कुल विषय नहीं है । बिना वजह है..(**व्यवधान**) आप इसको छोड़िए, पंजाब पर कहिए ।

श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : उसको क्यों डाइवर्ट करवाया ।

मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो विभिन्न धर्म, विभिन्न सम्प्रदाय के लोग हैं उनके खिलाफ आप किस तरह का...(**व्यवधान**) आचरण करते हैं । जबर्दस्ती शासन के बल पर उनको दबाना चाहते हैं तो देश के अन्दर विद्रोह होगा चाहे वह मिजोरम में हो, नागालैंड में हो, चाहे वह आसाम में हो जहां कहीं भी हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर आवाज उठाते हैं, आप उनको दबाते हैं ।

मैं अपनी बात खत्म करना चाहूंगा, मेरा समय उन लोगों ने बरबाद किया है । मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि चाहे काश्मीर का सवाल हो या पंजाब का सवाल हो, काश्मीर में चाहे फारुख अब्दुल्ला हों या पंजाब के अंदर संत लौंगोवाल या अकाली दल हों, आंध्र के अंदर एन०टी० रामाराव हो तामिलनाडु के अंदर एम०जी०आर० की सरकार हो या बंगाल के अंदर सी०पी० आई० (एम) की सरकार हो, ये चुनी हुई सरकारें अगर आपके मन के मुताबिक चलती हैं तो ठीक है लेकिन उनका केन्द्र से मतभेद होता हैं, उनका संवैधानिक मतभेद होता हैं, वैचारिक मतभेद होता हैं तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं हैं कि आप उस सरकार को तोड़ दें, उसको पलट दें, उसको मिटा दें । हमारे वैचारिक मतभेद होंगे, उठेंगे लेकिन केन्द्र के खिलाफ अगर बोलें तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं हैं कि..(**व्यवधान**) आप लाठी के बल पर तोड़ देंगे...(**व्यवधान**)

अगर आपको विश्वास हैं कि पंजाब का सिख समुदाय आपके साथ हैं अगर आपको विश्वास है कि पंजाब का सिख समुदाय..(**व्यवधान**) माननीय बूटा सिंह की सरदारी मानता है, पंजाब का सिख समुदाय संता सिंह को मानता हैं पंजाब का सिख समुदाय दरबारा सिंह को मानता हैं तो आप उन्हीं के हाथों में शासन दे दीजिए । आप दरबारा जी को मुख्य मंत्री बनाकर भेजिए बूटा सिंह को बनाकर भेजिए और नहीं होता तो संता सिंह को बनाइये, नहीं होता तो किसी और को लाइये, जितने नकली से नकली आदमियों को अपनी ताकत के बल पर पंजाब का राज्य देना चाहते हैं, दीजिए ...(व्यवधान) हिम्मत है तो पंजाब

[हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव]

में सरकार चलने दें आप क्यों लाठी के बल पर डंडे के बल पर पंजाब को दबाना चाहते हैं, स्वर्ण मंदिर को दबाना चाहते हैं, सिख समुदाय को दबाना चाहते हैं। तो यह जो केन्द्र का रवैया है, केन्द्र के इस तानाशाही रवैये के खिलाफ, केन्द्र की इस तानाशाही ताकत के खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान की जनता विद्रोही और बागी बनेगी, तो उस दिन देश को तोड़ने का अपराध आपके माथे जाएगा। देश आपके हाथ टूटेगा। आपने देश के इतिहास में हिन्दुस्तान का बटवारा किया था, हिन्दुस्तान-पाकिस्तान बनावाया और फिर हिन्दुस्तान को आगे तोड़ने का नापाक इरादा नहीं रखो। इसलिए हम आपका विरोध करते हैं।

श्री चयरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : उपसभापति जी, बावजूद इसके कि पंजाब में फौजी शासन कायम हुआ, स्थिति सम्भल नहीं रही। हम लोगों ने समझा था कि कुछ समय के लिए फौज जाकर मामले को सुधार सकेगी, वह बात सम्भव नहीं हो रही और शायद सदन के दोनों पक्ष के लोग सहमत होंगे कि किसी राज्य में फौज को ज्यादा दिन तक रखना हमारे अपने हित में भी नहीं है। अगर फौज के लोग समझ जाएं कि उन्हीं की बदौलत हम राज करते हैं, हमारी अपनी कोई राजनीतिक प्रतिष्ठा नहीं है, तो कल हमको भी गर्दन पर हाथ देकर वह निकाल देंगे।

इसी लिए मैं सरकार से कहूंगा कि वहां की स्थिति को सुलझाने में अब बहुत देर हो रही है और फौज को ज्यादा दिन रखना खतरे से खाली नहीं है। कम से कम स्वर्ण मंदिर से तो फौज तुरन्त हटा लीजिए। आप रखे हुए भी नहीं हैं, दो-चार-पांच आदमी हैं और उनको लेकर के कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। इसीलिए. . . (**व्यवधान**)

ठीक हैं आप तो किसी को बोलने नहीं देते हैं, आपको आजादी है। अगर आप यही समझतें हैं, तो हम क्या कहेंगे और इसी लिए तो हर जगह फौज भेजनी पड़ रही है।

श्री सैय्यद सिब्ते रजी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : आप चेयर से बोलिए।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : तो इसीलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि पहली बात तो आप वहां से फौज हटा लीजिए।

दूसरी बात मैं चाहता हूं कि आप जिन बातों को सही समझते हैं, जैसे चण्डीगढ़ मिले पंजाब को, या पानी के बंटवारे के लिये सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज ही उसका कोई फैसला लें—जिन बातों को प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं अपने भाषण में कहा था, उनको आप क्यों नही मान रहे हैं? उसमें आप देर करके सारे राष्ट्र के सामने इस संकट को बढ़ाते क्यों चले जा रहे हैं। आज भी एक पर एक हवाई-जहाज की हाईजैकिंग हो रही है, जब कि हमारी मिलिटरी और सरकार वहां है। आज भी हत्याएं हो रही हैं, आज भी हिंसात्मक घटनाएं रोजघट रही हैं। तब ऐसी स्थिति में जिन बातों को आप जरूरी समझते है—मैं गृह मंत्री से कहना चाहूंगा कि सिक्किम या आंध्र से पंजाब की तुलना नहीं की जा सकती है।

पंजाब में विदेशी सत्ता आकर के दखालंदाजी कर रही है, चाहे वह पड़ौस का पाकिस्तान हो, या दूसरे राष्ट्र के

लोग हों और संयोग से हमारे सिख भाई दुनिया भर में फैले हुए हैं और इसीलिए साम्राज्यवादी प्रेस और दूसरी चीजें उनकी मदद् कर रही हैं जिसकी तुलना सिक्किम से या आन्ध्र से नहीं की जा सकती । पंजाब की समस्या का एक बिलकुल नया डाइमेंशन हो गया है। इसीलिए यह एक राष्ट्रीय सवाल बन गया है और इस राष्ट्रीय सवाल को शासक पार्टी सिर्फ अपनी पार्टी के तरीके से हल करना चाहती है । यह खतरा उपस्थित है और सही खतरा उपस्थित है कि साम्राज्यवादी मदद से और कम्यूनलिज्म के नशे में काफी लोग इस तरह कर रहे हैं कि देश का फिर दूसरा टुकड़ा करना चाहते हैं, तो विरोधी पक्ष की पार्टियों के साथ अविलम्ब बैठ कर कोई सोलून्शन निकालने की तरफ हम लोगों को आगे बढ़ना चाहिए, नहीं तो मुझे भय है कि पंजाब में और भी ज्यादा दिन आप आर्मी रखेंगे तो पंजाब शायद ब्रिटेन का दूसरा अल्सटर हो जाएगा रिवर्स गियर में या पी०एल०ओ० जैसा स्थायी राष्ट्रीय हंगामा होता रहेगा, वह भी रिवर्स गियर में यानी साम्राज्य के पक्ष में । हिन्दुस्तान की बर्बादी के लिए यह बातें होंगी और इसीलिए आपसे हमारा अनुरोध है कि जिन बातों का आप सही समझते हैं, उनको अविलम्ब मान लीजिए। (**समय की घंटी**) इसको चुनाव घोषणा-पत्र के लिए मत रखिये कि उस दिन हम मानेंगे । यह पार्टीज़न आऊटलुक समाप्त कीजिए और यह राष्ट्रीय सवाल है, विरोध पक्ष के साथ बैठ कर के एक राष्ट्रीय कार्यक्रम बनाइये, जो सही में, जैसे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि हीलिंग टच देना चाहिये—वह हीलिंग टच, आर्मी से तो हीलिंग टच नहीं होता है । आर्मी से जो टच होता है, सो हम और आप सभी जानते हैं ।

इसी लिए आप इस आर्मी को हटाइये और राजनीतिक समाधान की ओर अविलम्ब आगे बढ़िये ।

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there has been a lot of discussion on punjab. (*Interruptions*) My friend says: "Don't bring in Andhra here." I assure him I will not bring in Andhra because there is no need for me to tell you about Andhra and because the people of Andhra Pradesh are capable.....

AN HON. MEMBER: They have accepted.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Therefore, there is no point. And, also, I would like to assure the Member that the people of Andhra Pradesh, six and a half crores people of Andhra Pradesh, will give a fitting answer in the days to come, in the months to come, in the years to come. Therefore, there is no need for me to talk about Andhra Pradesh here today. Let there be no misapprehension in the mind of the hon. Member. Immediately somebody stands up they say: 'Are you going to speak about Andhra?" It only shows how much exercised you are about your guilt, because you have committed a sin, because you have committed atrocities. You are rescapable...

AN HON. MEMBER: Who has committed?

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You have committed. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we are standing at the crossroads of history and

[Prof. C. Lakshmanna]

history will decide. We need not be worried about it. I did not want to raise it.

I was only saying that the legally elected Government—in this case, it was Congress Government—has been kept in animated suspension when Parliament was in existence. Sir, the Lok Sabha has been adjourned and the Rajya Sabha may be adjourned today or tomorrow. And if things stand as they are, there may not be another session of Lok Sabha and, therefore, of Rajya Sabha. That means, in the coming four, five or six months, during the period for which you are seeking the extension of President's rule there would not be any representative body even to discuss the problems which may arise there and the entire thing has to be left to the administrators who have been appointed by the Union Government. Therefore, I do not see any reason why a representative Government cannot function there. I am not using the word 'popular' Government which in normal parlance is the word that is used. If the Assembly is revived, if a popular or a representative Government is installed, at least there will be an occasion for people to represent their views through their representatives in the discussion in the Assembly. That is being denied.

Sir, when the Amendment Bill was here, it was assured that it was not the intention of the Union Government to extend; if possible, they would like immediately to have a representative Government. Hardly have the words written on the paper dried, and already we see another Resolution seeking the extension of President's Rule in Punjab for six months. That means, Sir, for one and a half years the people's representatives have been kept in a position of neither here nor there, and the Government has been functioning under the dictates of certain specified people who have been put by the Union Government. In the beginning of this session, we were assured of a healing touch. I see the hand everywhere, the important hand everywhere. It is moving all over Punjab; it is moving over all other States. But it never touches. Therefore, there is no healing touch. So I am looking for the healing touch. How long will it take and what efforts will be made by that hand to heal?

DR. JOSEPH LEON D'SOUZA: Your memory is very short. In 1975, Morarjibhai threatened to go on strike and went on strike and brought down a Government that was in a majority. Your memory is very short.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Sir, I would like to re-assert that I do not hold brief...

DR. JOSEPH LEON D'SOUZA: You are the people who have shown the fine art of toppling. In 1975, Morarjibhai threatened to go on strike and went on strike and a majority Government fell. Will you explain that? You are talking about morality. (*Interruptions*) So you admit that you were doing an immoral thing. Also, admit that you taught us this. Despite your teaching, we have not done it.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to reiterate that I do not hold brief either for the Janata Government or the Congress Government. Any Government which touches Governments representing the will of the people, I oppose. I have made it very clear earlier. There is no point in Dr. D'Souza or anybody else standing up and pointing out something for which I am not responsible and my party is not responsible. My leader did not accept nor did I accept such a fact. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, he is crossing limits. I have been very patient and answering, and he talks whatever he wants. You please stop him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You address the Chair.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: I am protesting to the Chair. He should listen to me, as I have heard him a number of times.

I was looking for healing touch. I am not finding any healing touch. A healing touch will come only when there is initiation of a political discussion. A discussion will ultimately lead to installation of an elected Government there and it will allow that Government to take decisions for the people of that State. Otherwise, Sir, this type of Presidential rule will not help.

Another thing, Sir, Bhindranwale has gone, the Akalis are in jail, and still we occasionally hear of terrorism. The latest example is what has happened only two days back. If that is the case, Sir, you cannot today blame the dead Bhindranwale or the jailed Akali Dal. Who has to be held responsible for the things of this type, which are going on in Punjab? Is the Government, the Union Government, accepting the responsibility for what is happening there, not only what happened the day-before-yesterday but also occasionally? Therefore, Sir, merely by having the President's rule we cannot ensure a clean Government there. The only way in which the people's will can be represented is through revival of the elected Government which is kept in suspended animation.

Therefore, Sir, I appeal to the Union Home Minister to reconsider this. There is no need for the President's rule. The elected Government is capable of looking after. And that is his own Government, Sir. Therefore, Sir, if he is prepared to reconsider, I will be very happy. However, I know that he will not be prepared to reconsider. Therefore, I oppose this Resolution.

SHRI RAMKRISHNA MAZUMDER (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir the Punjab questions have been discussed in this House many times. And each and every time it has been stated by the hon. ex-Chief Minister of Punjab that it is the prosperity of the people of Punjab which is the genesis of the Punjab problem. Not only that, the Prime Minister also has stated again and again when she participated in the debate that it is the prosperity which is the genesis of this problem.

If you cannot have a true perspective of the situation in Punjab, you cannot tackle the situation. I want to say that it is not the prosperity but the poverty of the people which is the genesis of this question. I am giving a plain picture of the economic conditions in Punjab. I shall be glad if it is refuted by the hon. Home Minister or by the hon. ex-Chief Minister. What is the economic position of Punjab today? 48.44 per cent of the farming house-holds have small holdings, less than 5 acres, and together, that is, 48.44 per cent own only 13.13 per cent of land. While 41.56 per cent own 49.79 per cent of the area, a major section of the land, that is 37.08 per cent is held by the remaining 10 per cent. Forty-five per cent of the population lives below the poverty line.

Not only that. The fruits of the green revolution are going to be enjoyed only by the top 10 per cent of the households. A World Bank study had warned of increasing social tension caused by this kind of lopsided development.

[Shri Ramkrishna Mazumdar]

Another picture is, the area tilled by each agricultural labour in 1966 was 2.23 hectares. It was reduced in 1971 to 1.75 hectares. It was again reduced in 1981 to 1.5 hectares. The number of unemployed in technical and professional courses in 1966 registered was 9,321; and in the year 1981 the number of unemployed in technical and professional courses registered increased to 64,771. Even in the case of clerical in 1966 the number of persons registered were 2,713; and in the year 1981 it has increased to 45,708. So, the total number of unemployed registered in 1966 was 50,578 and it has increased to 486,081 in 1981. So, this is the poverty of the people which has caused due to the prosperity which was narrated by the Prime Minister or by the ex-Chief Minister. This is the genesis of the whole thing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Majumder, Labour is not available in Punjab. Labourers from Bihar and Uttar Pradesh go there...

SHRI RAMKRISHNA MAZUMDER: Because I want to limit my discussion on Punjab on extension of President's rule only. This is one aspect.

The second aspect about which I want to give a reminder to the Government, through you, is that the sociological context of Punjab in the historical perspective is unjust and you cannot solve the problem. The Indian societies plural—the Indian societies multi-lingual must be projected through the actual federal polity. The ruling party at the Centre is not aware of the nature of the diversity of the Indian society and its plural characteristics. The Government cannot realise the need of actual federal polity and that is why from the sociological point of view they are making blunder after blunder. In this way by imposing President's rule without analying the sociological context you can try to preserve the geographical integrity, but you cannot preserve the national integrity till you realise the historical mandatory fact that Indian society is plural, multi-lingual and multi-nationalities. I repeat multi-lingual and multi-nationalities. Sir, by extending the President's rule the Government cannot solve the problem. Instead of it they should analyse it socially, politically and economically. That is why I oppose this extension of President's rule for the period which has been placed by the Hon'ble Home Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jagdambi Prasad Yadav.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभापति जी, मैं गृह मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जो राष्ट्रपति का शासन अभी तक रहा उस शासन को आप 6 महीने और बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, इस शासन काल में जिस समस्या के निदान के लिए आपने विधान सभा को निलम्बित किया है आप अभी तक यह भी साफ नहीं कर पाये हैं कि विधान सभा को समाप्त किया जाय, क्या चुनाव कराया जाय या न कराया जाय । विधान सभा वहां कायम है, सदस्य लोग मौजूद हैं, भले ही दरबारा सिंह को मुख्य मंत्री के बदले राज्य सभा का सदस्य बना दिया । आप 6 महीने के भीतर अपने दिमाग को यह भी साफ नहीं कर सके कि विधान सभा का जो सदन है उस का क्या हो । एक तो यह सवाल है जिसको आप को साफ करना चाहिए कि आप चाहते क्या हैं ।

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि राष्ट्रपति के शासन काल में दरबारा सिंह के शासन काल में जो रहा था उस की पुनरावृत्ति हो रही है या नहीं, लोग

मारे जा रहे हैं या नहीं, लोगों में अविश्वास का वातावरण है या नहीं और आज भी जो हीलिंग टच हो रही है उस का क्या हो रहा है। मैंने एक बात जरूर देखी कि सरबत खालसा हुआ, कार सेवा चल रही है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बहुत कामयाब रहा।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हमारे एक माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि बहुत कामयाब रहा। मैं भी चाहता हूं कि इस को कामयाब कहूं, लेकिन दूसरे विश्व सिख सम्मेलन करना चाहते हैं, दूसरा सरबत खालसा करना चाहते हैं उसकी अनुमति आप क्यों नहीं दे रहे हैं? आपके वहां के कलेक्टर कहते हैं वे लोग चार लाख की संख्या में आयेंगे, हम उस की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकेंगे। यह हीलिंग टच का कौन-सा फार्मूला है मेरी समझ में बात नहीं आ रही है। मैं गृह मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं कि हीलिंग टच की कौन-कौन सी प्रक्रिया आपने अपनाई है। दूसरी बात यह जानना चाहता हूं कि माननीय उपसभापति महोदय कह रहे थे कि बिहार की बात हमारे पूर्ववक्ता ने कही है लेकिन बिहार भी बहुत बड़े ढंग से इन्वाल्व है। जो वहां कृषक मजदूर हैं वह बहुतायत संख्या में हैं, बिहार के हैं। हजारों, लाखों मजदूर इस सिच्युएशन से परेशान हो कर भागे हुए हैं। वे वहां रह रहे हैं। पंजाब ने हरितक्रांति का बहुत बड़ा दृश्य उपस्थित किया है, एक तो कारण यह है। पंजाब ने उद्योग धंधों में भी अपनी अच्छी स्थिति बना ली है लेकिन इन दिनों में हीलिंग टच नहीं हो रहा है, बेकार की स्थिति बन रही है। आपने 6 महीने के लिये पहले भी शासन बढ़ाया था इसलिए आप यह बताइये कि जो अभी तक आपने समय लिया है उस समय में आपने क्या कुछ किया है।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं जो दिखाई नहीं दे रही है। जैसा कि अखबार में छपता है कि सिख उग्रवादियों ने स्थिति काफी आक्रान्त कर रखी है। एक प्रकार से हिन्दुस्तान में धीरे-धीरे सिखों के प्रति शंकाएं क्रिएट की जा रही हैं। कई सिखों ने यह भी कहा है कि कई जगहों पर उन्हें शंका की निगाह से देखा जाता है। उन्हें बहुत परेशानी होती है। जो हीलिंग टच है एक दूसरे के नजदीक आने की, यह अभी तक क्यों नहीं हो पा रहा है? ये जो शंकाएं सम्पूर्ण देश में पैदा होती जायेगी राष्ट्रपति के शासन में तो आगे चल कर भविष्य में यह क्या रूप लेगा यह स्थिति आपको साफ करनी पड़ेगी। मैं आपसे विनम्रता पूर्वक कहना चाहता हूं कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि गलती में हम खालिस्तानी मार्ग से प्रशस्त हो जाए। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि केन्द्रीय शासन में कम से कम आप इतना एशयोर करें कि पंजाब का वातावरण हिन्दू और सिख की एकता का बन पाएगा। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि आप पंजाब में ऐसी स्थिति लायें जैसी कि पूर्ववत थी। ऐसी स्थिति के लिये जो कुछ आप करना चाहते हैं उसी संदर्भ में हमें बतायें कि क्या करने जा रहे है जिससे पता लगे कि आगे के 6 महीने में वहां पर कैसी स्थिति हो जायेगी। यह इसलिये भी आवश्यक है क्योंकि उस वक्त न राज्य सभा होगी और न ही लोक सभा। उस वक्त शायद चुनाव कराये जा रहे होंगे। उस समय आपकी जिम्मेदारी ज्यादा रहेगी, आपका दारमदार

[श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव]

ज्यादा होगा। आपके इस निर्णय से चुनाव के जरिये सारे देश में एक वातावरण बन जायेगा। इसी बात पर मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता था।

*SHRI N. RAJANGAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy-Chairman, Sir, during the past 4-5 years the entire State of Punjab was in political turmoil. During 1983 and 1984 the situation worsened to the extent of large scale depredation and destruction of public property besides wanton killing of innocent men, women and children. A barrier between the people of one community in Punjab and the rest in the country was thus created. Sant Bhindrawale converted the Golden Temple in Amritsar into an arsenal of sophisticated arms and ammunition. The sanctity of the temple was sullied. When conclusive proof was established about the illegal storage of arms in this place of worship, our Prime Minister and her Government decided to send the Army so that normalcy can be restored. The army tackled the growing number of terrorists in Punjab. The Golden Temple was cleared of weapons of destruction. This was a challenge to the unity of the country. I, on behalf of my party AI-ADMK, commend the timely action taken by our Prime Minister in Punjab. Slowly the law and order in Punjab is being restored.

For several years my party has been opposing the continuance of Article 356 of the Constitution . Perarignar Anna, the founder-member of DMK, was opposed to Article 356. Yet he also was constrained to spport it in the interest of the nation. When China had aggressed India, Anna had just been released from jail. He was in prison for six months. The whole of Tamil Nadu was expecting a political storm. The Congress Government had heaped indignities upon Anna in the prison. The people were thinking that Anna would be spiteful. The people were waiting for his command. 3.5 lakh people had gathered in Madras Beach to hear Anna. The question that was foremost in the minds of the people was the choice between dictatorship and democracy. Anna, who personified in himself the Gandhian ideals and who practised them in his life opted for democracy. He said that democracy with all its deficiencies and drawbacks is best-suited for India. He said: "Even if my party is destroyed in this process, I do not mind. I have suffered imprisonment. I do not mind. I have suffered imprisonment. My party may suffer political oblivion also, yet I want democracy. We should fight China and protect the country. Indian sub-continent should be saved". He gave this clarion call to the assembled millions. He supported Article 356 to strengthen the hands of the Central Government.

My leader, Thiru MGR, the undisputed guiding star of Tamil Nadu, though he is opposed in principle to Article 356, supports it to save India from impending chaos. The country is bigger than personal predelictions. On behalf of my party, I support this Resolution. The political party is not more important than the nation.

This House is a House of Elders, representing the cumulative wisdom of the country. The Lok Sabha might be impetuous but this House should temper that impetuosity. This House should lay guidelines for the country as a whole after considering the views expressed here. The nation must be protected at any cost. When the nation is passing through critical times, we have no alternative except

*English translation of the original speech delivered in Tamil.

to support Article 356 of the Constitution. I extend my support to this Resolution and resume my seat.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, since this subject has been debated at length and almost all the aspects have been covered, I would not like to take more time of the House.

The main thing is that there are some common points between the opposition and the ruling party. What are these common points? Let us try to understand them and then try to work out a solution on that basis for the future.

No one has seriously suggested that the Army should be withdrawn from Punjab, though some have said that it may be withdrawn from the sensitive spot of the Golden Temple. You are not seriously suggesting withdrawal of the Army from Punjab. You do agree that the situation there is extraordinary and, therefore, extraordinary measures might continue.

Those friends who are today suggesting that Shri Darbara Singh should be made again the Chief Minister of the State had demanded President's rule when he was ruling Punjab. Now they are making a some result.

At that time you did not care much for democracy. Now when we are trying to stabilise the situation and restore order, in the name of democracy, you are saying: Please instal a popular Government there.

I do not think they are serious about it.

There is a general consensus that Army should not be withdrawn. Then what is to be done? They say: "You start a dialogue." We are not opposed to the dialogue because a situation of war or tension cannot continue for long. The Sikhs are part and parcel of our nation. They are our brothers. There is no animosity between the Sikhs and others.

Some opposition leaders had gone to Punjab two or three weeks back to assess the situation. This has been reported in the press. They met some Akali and SGPC leaders inside the Golden Temple and asked them to declare that killings of innocent people is against the ethics of Sikh religion; that it was wrong to have harboured criminals inside the Golden Temple, that they would not misuse religious places, and that they should condemn terrorists and terrorism. Their response was dismal and they were disappointed and this is reported by them in the Press.

Sir, is this a normal situation? Just two days back a plane was hijacked. Is this a normal situation?

In foreign countries, Shri Jagjit Singh Chauhan, is going on repeatedly saying that he firmly believes in physically liquidating the Prime Minister of India. Mind you, Sir, in spite of our repeated demands that the British Government should do something about it, they have done nothing. Only some days back we asked them whether under the British law such a person could be prosecuted or not and there is no response from that side. Hijacking is going on. What happened on the 15th August in USA? We all know.

On the one hand, the Akali Leaders are refusing to denounce violence and, on the other, a plane is being hijacked. And, Sir, the collaboration of the Pakistani Government—if you do not like that harsh word, then I would say, some linkage—is there as my friend has pointed out. You have to take into account the whole background of the Punjab situation and

[Shri Chimanbhai Mehta]

then come to a conclusion. The honourable Home Miniser has made it clear that if the situation permits, he would like to have a popular government tomorrow because we know that in the circumstances obtaining today, a Congress(I) Government can be installed and so, it is not a question of refusing to allow anybody to come to power since the Opposition might come to power in Punjab. That is not the situation.

Now, Sir, they are talking about the "healing touch". Sir, are we not serious about the healing touch? We do not doubt the patriotism of the Opposition people nor have we said that they are anti-national. But everytime we see that when Pakistan gets involved in something, the BJP Members raise the question of normalisation with Pakistan. I heard the BJP Member very carefully in last session also and he said, "Do not overreact to Pakistan" although Pakisten has got something against us. This time also, yesterday, on the question whether the pistol was supplied or not at Lahore, "Why don't you make it categorical" They ask us.

On the Opposition side there are patriotic people. Although their patriotism is beyond doubt, although they are patriotic, and although we honour them, our approaches are different and that is the misfortune of our country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. That will do.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Sir, we and they have common points. There is only one person in India who opposed this Army action in Punjab. Of course, Army entering the Golden Temple nobody liked. But this gentleman said that the Army should not have gone there, should not have been sent to the Golden Temple. And that gentleman is more but Mr. N. T. Rama Rao. Now, behind that gentleman the entire Opposition is rallying. You have got many other points to rally round. But why Mr. Rama Rao? (*Interruptions*)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Sir, is he talking about Punjab or something else? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Sir, there are some people who still do not understand the serious implications of the Punjab situation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, that will do.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: Sir, the Government has got everything documented. But the Opposition was blaming the Government saying that in the White Paper it did not mention about the CIA. There is a news in 'International Herald Tribune'...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA: That the U.S. Government and their people approached our Government and requested not to mention the CIA's hand and American hand in Punjab. Sir, had we mentioned the name of America and CIA in our Punjab affairs, the dimension would have been changed and very serious situation would have occurred. If America is caught red-handed in destabilising India... (*Interruptions*).

People go to the United States in the name of physical treatment, try to meet Reagon and when they come here and they are expelled by their own party from the position of power, in the name of democracy they hijack their own people in the jungles of Karnataka, and here they come and talk about democracy and how we should behave in Punjab. (*Time bell rings*) All these questions should be kept in view.

Again I will request the Opposition that between us and you there are so many common points. Let us not go by short-sighted considerations in view of the coming three months. Three months are not going to make an extraordinary history. But if we fail in uniting our efforts in Punjab, posterity will definitely say that the leaders of the present state of affairs did not behave well. (*Interruptions*)

Thank you very much.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, this Resolution has come before the House in pursuance of the constitutional amendment which we accepted only the day before yesterady. This is actually a part of it; it completes it. Now, the same debate which we had the day before yesterday has been repeated, word for word, argument for argument. I do not wish to emulate this example by repeating my reply also, word for word, argument for argument. (*Interruptions*) Not a single new word has been said—for obvious reasons; nothing has happened within these 48 hours. (*Interruptions*) The reasons why the constitutional amendment was brought I have explained in great detail. I have met all the points raised the day before yesterday. They hold good for this Resolution also. So I beg of Members not to find fault with me if I do not follow their example. Let us pass this resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. (*Interruptions*) Now, the question is:

"That this House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 6th Ocotber, 1983, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Punjab, for a further period of six months with effect from the 6th October, 1984."

The motion was adopted.

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही 3 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-four minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at one minute past three of the clock, **(The Vice-Chairman (Shri Syed Rammat Ali)** in the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED RAHMAT ALI): Now, we shall take up Special Mentions. Dr. D'Souza.

REFERENCE TO THE NEED TO CHECK THE RISING PRICE OF METRANIDAZOLE DRUG

DR. JOSEPH LEON D'SOUZA (Maharashtra): Sir, persistent maintenance of very high price notified by the Government for essential bulk-drugs, Metranidazole at Rs. 497.98 per kilogram and Metranidazole Benzoxylate at Rs. 600 per kilogram despite sharp decline in the prices notified by the Bulk-drug Manufacturers and also its free availability in the common market.

During the past 3 years Members of Parliament have represented, through Starred and Unstarred Questions, trying to focus the attention of the Government regarding the sharp fall in the Bulk Drug prices and the urgent need to revise the price notified by the Government at Rs. 497.98 per kilogram.

In November 1982, Government called upon the B.I.C.P. to investigate and recommend change in the price structure, if necessary. I refer to Unstarred Question No. 916 answered on 7th May, 1984.